REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the present amendment and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-28 are presently active in this case. The present amendment amends Claim 25. Support for the present amendment can be found, for example, in Figures 2 and 3, along with their corresponding description. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

The outstanding Office Action rejected Claims 11-20, 22-24, and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by <u>Huynh et al.</u> (U.S. Patent 6,871,492, hereinafter "<u>Huynh</u>"); and objected to Claims 21 and 25, but indicated they were allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 21 and 25. However, since Applicants consider that Claims 11 and 16, from which Claims 21 and 25 depend, define patentable subject matter, Claims 21 and 25 are maintained in dependent form at the present time.

In response to the rejection of Claims 11-20, 22-24, and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection and traverse the rejection as discussed next.

Turning now to the cited reference, <u>Huynh</u> describes a process and system for controlling the mixture composition for a spark ignition Otto engine with a NO_x storage catalyst during a regeneration phase. Specifically <u>Huynh</u> describes controlling the mixture composition during the regeneration phase by making a predetermined afterinjection NI and by controlling the λ value of the main combustion such that the λ_M value of the exhaust gas

fed to the NO_x storage catalyst 5 assumes a constant pilot value λ_{REG} , until the intervention value λ_i has been reached by λ_K .

However, <u>Huynh</u> fails to teach or suggest "analyzing a composition of exhaust gases by an oxygen sensor situated solely downstream from the purifying mechanism during a phase of regeneration of the purifying mechanism and creating a signal for control of the engine based on the analysis to modify the composition of the exhaust gases upstream from the purifying mechanism," as recited in Claim 11.

Instead, <u>Huynh</u> describes that, in order to keep the value of the exhaust gas emitted by the NO_x storage catalyst λ_K at a constant value, the λ value of the main combustion chamber λ_M is monitored and controlled until λ_K reaches its desired value.² Thus, the composition of the exhaust gases is not controlled by creating a signal to control the engine based solely on an output of the measuring sensor 10b downstream of the NO_x storage catalyst 5.

It is respectfully submitted that <u>Huynh</u> does not teach or suggest all of the elements recited in Claim 11. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection of Claim 11, and all claims dependent thereon, as anticipated by <u>Huynh</u> be withdrawn.

Further, as Claim 16 recites similar features to Claim 11, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection of Claim 16, and all claims dependent thereon, as anticipated by <u>Huynh</u> be withdrawn.

The present amendment is submitted in accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.116, which, after Final rejection, permits entry of amendments placing the claims in better form for consideration on appeal. The present amendment is not believed to raise new issues because the changes to Claim 25 are merely to keep Claim 25 consistent with Claim 11, from which Claim 25 depends. The changes to Claim 25 are of a minor nature. It

8

See <u>Huynh</u>, at column 6, lines 23-30, with corresponding Figure 2.

² See Huynh, at column 6, lines 23-46.

is therefore respectfully requested that 37 C.F.R. §1.116 be liberally construed, and that the present amendment be entered.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.

Attorney of Record

Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number 22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 03/06) CBH/rac

I:\ATTY\CBH\27s\273941US\PROP RESP 3.12.07.DOC